

City of Binghamton
Commission on Architecture and Urban Design
24 November, 2015
Minutes

Date: 24 November, 2015
Location: Planning Department Conference Room

Members Present:

M. Atchie
J. Darrow
S. Edwards
K. Ellsworth
P. Klosky
M. Mauro

Others Present:

J. Boyd, Assistant Director of Economic Development
S. Campbell, Representative of the Broome County Humane Society
K. Findley, Applicant of 257 & 263 Washington Street
R. Murphy, Ex-officio member & Director of Economic Development
C. Snyder, Historic Preservation Planner
T. Costello, Ex-officio member & Supervisor of Building and Code

Absent: J. Smith

K. Ellsworth called the meeting to order at approximately 12:06PM.

Approval of Minutes: Oct 22nd Meeting

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

Motion carried (5-0-2)

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky, S. Edwards

Nays: None

Absent: J. Smith

Recused: M. Atchie,

Approval of Minutes: Oct 27th Meeting

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by M. Mauro

Motion carried (5-0-1)

Ayes: M. Atchie, K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky

Nays: None

Absent: J. Smith

Recused: S. Edwards

Items Heard:

167 Conklin Avenue- (Determination of Significance) (2015-62)

Sarah Campbell represented the Applicant, The Broome County Humane Society. S. Campbell presented the project before the Commission detailing the future use of the site as the Humane Society headquarters and animal shelter. The site will include a new 12,000 square foot, two-story structure. Edwards mentioned that the current building does not meet the needs of the Applicant and would need to be demolished.

J. Darrow explained that in his opinion that the building had no historical significance. M. Atchie asked if there were further comments from the Commission; there were none.

J. Darrow motioned for NO HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE, P. Klosky seconded the motion, and added that he applauded the work in designing the building and site, and encouraged that the Humane Society have a well-developed evacuation and emergency plan put in place because of the buildings proximity to the river as a potential flood hazard. S. Campbell stated that the Applicant has submitted a plan for emergency evacuation to the Planning Board.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Motion of NO HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky

Motion carried (5-0-0)

Ayes: M. Atchie, M. Mauro, J. Smith

Nays: None

Absent: J. Smith

Recused: K. Ellsworth

21 Chenango Street - (Signage Review) (2015-52)

The Applicant, Stephen Donnelly asked to postpone the review of his project until the December 29th meeting of CAUD. The Applicant was notified of zoning violations as a result of the improper installation of signage approved at the previous CAUD meeting. The Applicant requested that he review the violations with the property owner and come to the December meeting for a resolution.

The violation includes:

1. **VIOLATING THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:** The Applicant drilled directly into buildings stone façade instead of mounting the signage to the mortar joints of the stone facing as required by the Commission.

2. COMPLETION OF WORK OUTSIDE OF CAUD’S APPROVAL: The Applicant placed two projecting banner signs on the east facing façade which is not code compliant and not part of the October approvals for signage on this building.

C. Snyder added that the Applicant has 30 days to reconcile the violation, and that he would be in discussions with the Applicant to ensure that they meet these guidelines.

K. Ellsworth questioned what the process of reparation of the homes would include. Inquiring as to what options the Applicant has in reparation of the building. C. Snyder responded stating that he needs to do further research to find what the most effective solution would be for the Applicant to resolve and/or repair the violation. K. Ellsworth asked if this would be an enforcement issue and what department would be responsible for this. The question was left open to conversation between internal City departments.

J. Darrow added that it’s important that City Staff is proactive about this because the materials and placement were placed outside of the conditional approval, posing a threat to the building’s exterior integrity.

K. Ellsworth questioned if we violated zoning code in the last meeting because of the 30 day temporary signage clause. C. Snyder stated that after conversation with Corporation Counsel, it was resolved that CAUD can make amended decisions to zoning code under certain circumstances; in this case, the extension of temporary signage for a specific building with just cause. K. Ellsworth added that the board should have a discussion about consistency of ‘gray area’s’. J. Darrow included that he thinks it would be wise to have a Corporation Counsel Representative to come to CAUD and explain their rights as a board in making decisions that directly affect, or are in contradiction to established zoning code.

263 Washington Street - (Design Charrette) (2015-84)

The Applicant Kevin Findley, appeared before the commission to review a preliminary and incomplete proposal of building alterations and improvements to get feedback, suggestions, and direction from the Commissioners, and to approve some of the proposed materials for the building. The Applicant noted that this would be the first of several meetings with CAUD to review this particular project.

The Applicant discussed the overall scope of the project, detailing the project improvements as a quasi-restoration with modern materials. The Applicant detailed an elevator shaft and stairwell addition to the backside of the structure using brick and stone to match the existing structure. J. Darrow inquired as to the type of elevator shaft it would be. The Applicant explained that the elevator shaft would be wrapped with a stairwell for ingress/egress and fire code.

The Applicant discussed the roof as a flat roof with a false-mansard, more accurately a faux-hipped roof in style. C. Snyder added that the addition would appear to be non-existent from the front of the building and would not drastically alter the massing or appearance of the building.

The Applicant detailed the materials and ornamental alterations to the building, detailing that he would like to use a PVC or hardened foam materials for the proposed columns, and also for some of the deteriorating ornamental features on the structure. Windows on the building are varied in size and lights, the Applicant wishes to place windows with consistent lights to cut the cost of replacements.

Materials for approval were then discussed at length. The Applicant proposed a faux-slate material for the roof rather than an asphalt shingle. J. Darrow stated that the installation costs and cost of the materials would be extremely high and recommended a faux-slate asphalt shingle instead. J. Darrow recommended the Applicant instead look at 86 Chestnut Street or 9 Asbury Court where he can see examples of the asphalt system. The Applicant stated he would consider that product. C. Snyder stated that the recommended asphalt slate more closely resembled what appeared to be the original.

K. Ellsworth addressed the previous window conversation, asking the board if they had any reservations about the preliminary proposal for windows. K. Findley added that there are a few windows that are highly specialized, and that would be kept or replaced as original as possible. The Commission generally agreed that the windows discussed were a historically appropriate improvement to the building. K. Findley added that he would match the roofing material color to the bluestone chosen for the window sills.

C. Snyder added that the columns and some of the balconies were not original to the building. K. Findley added that he wanted to bump out and expand the balcony bays because of the issues of heat loss and water penetration, as well as to expand the living space. The Commission agreed that they would need to see architectural and engineering drawings to make a determination on whether or not the alteration is appropriate. K. Findley also proposed a material for the siding – a faux cedar shake made from a hardened foam materials. The material has little maintenance.

K. Ellsworth commented that the project looks promising and the direction is positive from a historic preservation standpoint. He also added that the board would need an engineering drawing for the front of the building and structural changes that are to be made. K. Ellsworth, J. Darrow, and P. Klosky agreed that K. Findley should put together a color board of samples and materials that will be placed on the building for his next meeting. K. Findley stated that he could wait for the next meeting for final approvals so that he will then have finalized materials and scope of work figured out for the future of the project.

257 Washington Street- (Design Review) (2015-82)

The Applicant Kevin Findley, appeared before the commission for design review of his proposed project. The Applicant completed some elements of work in violation with a previous approval and came to CAUD to explain further alterations and improvements as well.

K. Findley proposed the replacement of all windows on the façade as have already been done with several windows on the north façade. The Applicant explained that the goal is to replace all the windows over time, and all of the windows that are broken or deteriorated and need to be replaced immediately. Two different windows were proposed for the building. K. Ellsworth asked for the Commission to focus on the windows that were placed on the building, as these windows are proposed for all other opening on the building. K. Ellsworth asked for the Commission to decide on the appropriateness of the windows.

M. Mauro leaves at 1:16.

J. Darrow motioned to approve the seven (7) windows already installed and also to approve the additional matching windows as budgetary constraints allow in the progression of the project – excluding the basement windows at this time. Seconded by P. Klosky, and unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky

Motion carried (5-0-0)

Ayes: M. Atchie, S. Edwards, K. Ellsworth,

Nays: None

Absent: M. Mauro, J. Smith

Recused: None

K. Ellsworth asked about the basement windows that the Applicant had previously touched upon. The Commission discussed the basement windows. K. Ellsworth and J. Darrow agreed that a picture of the window could be used. J. Darrow motioned to conditionally approve the window with examples or visualizations of the windows to be approved by the chair. The motion was seconded by S. Edwards and unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by S. Edwards

Motion carried (5-0-0)

Ayes: M. Atchie, K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky

Nays: None

Absent: M. Mauro, J. Smith

Recused: None

M. Atchie leaves at 1:30.

K. Findley proposed two accent lighting sconces. J. Darrow motioned to approve the sconce as proposed, seconded by P. Klosky and unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by S. Edwards

Motion carried (4-0-0)

Ayes: K. Ellsworth, P. Klosky

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, M. Mauro, J. Smith

Recused: None

K. Findley proposed an accessibility ramp on the north side of the building adjacent to the parking lot. The Applicant detailed the scope of the ramp and materials. J. Darrow motioned to approve the ramp as proposed with Trex Reveal railing system, reinforced rebar, and brick facing. Seconded by P. Klosky and unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky

Motion carried (4-0-0)

Ayes: S. Edwards, K. Ellsworth,

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, M. Mauro, J. Smith

Recused: None

K. Findley proposed two doors for the north side of the structure that will be commercial and utilitarian in nature. The original doors were very similar with little historic ornament or features. J. Darrow motioned to approve the future doors to match the front east doors of the building. Seconded by P. Klosky and unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky

Motion carried (4-0-0)

Ayes: S. Edwards, K. Ellsworth,

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, M. Mauro, J. Smith

Recused: None

K. Findley showed the penetration of mechanicals on the building which affected the appearance of the exterior façade. The Applicant explained the details of the penetrations and their purpose for the mechanical functions of the building. All penetrations were necessary per manufacturer specifications. The Applicant proposed painting the venting a chestnut bronze color to match the

windows and detract from their utilitarian functions. J. Darrow motioned to approve the painting of the mechanicals. P. Klosky seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Moved by J. Darrow, seconded by P. Klosky

Motion carried (4-0-0)

Ayes: S. Edwards, K. Ellsworth,

Nays: None

Absent: M. Atchie, M. Mauro, J. Smith

Recused: None

K. Ellsworth stated that the repointing and replacement of brick on the building was not approved and asked what should be done about this issue. C. Snyder stated that in the future all repointing of mortar or replacement of brick must come to CAUD for approval of materials.

Other Business:

Other business was postponed because of the length of the meeting and need for Commissioners to leave. A special meet may be scheduled to discuss other business materials.

Adjournment: 1:46 PM

Moved by K. Ellsworth, seconded by S. Edwards

Unanimously approved